

Application No.: 09/824,931

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for granting the Personal Interview conducted at the Patent Office on July 20, 2004. An Interview Summary describing the nature of the Applicants arguments and the Examiners comments was filed by the Applicants on August 6, 2004.

Upon entry of this amendment, Claims 1-16, and 27-28 are pending, and of these, claims 1, 9, and 27 are independent. Applicants appreciate the Examiners suggestions made at the personal interview with respect to providing clarity to the claims, and have amended claims 1, 9, and 27 to include the limitation of each synthesis area separated by a discard area, the support for which may be found in the description on page 26, line 16 *et seq.* Applicants respectfully assert that the addition of discard area to the claims provide clarity to the plurality of reticle areas each associated with a synthesis area, where each synthesis area is separate from one another. In other words, the discard area emphasizes the independence of the multiple non-contiguous synthesis areas on the substrate that are each associated with a reticle area on the mask.

Applicants also respectfully assert that the added limitation provides additional discrimination from the disclosure of Hess et al. (2002/0094533) as discussed in the response filed July 1, 2004. Applicants reiterate the assertion that Hess et al. describes a mask that interfaces with the surface of a platen, but not describe aligning at least two reticles in each of a plurality of reticle areas with each of the plurality of synthesis areas on the substrate associated with a reticle area. Further Hess et al. does not teach each of the multiple synthesis areas being separated by a discard area or the platen that includes

Application No.: 09/824,931

multiple synthesis areas with monomers coupled at a plurality of locations specified by each of the reticles aligned.

During the interview, the Examiner also raised his concern over the definition in the claims of the spatial arrangement and division of each of the reticle areas and reticles on the mask, providing examples such as reference marks or lines on the mask that divide and define each of the reticles and reticle areas. Applicants respectfully point out the limitations in each of claims 1, 9, and 27 of the substantially contiguous arrangement of each of the plurality of reticles in each reticle area, and the substantially contiguous arrangement of each of the plurality of reticle areas on the mask that provides for a reference with respect to the spatial arrangement of each of the reticles and reticle areas. Applicants would like to bring to the Examiners attention that the term substantially was omitted from each of claims 1, 9, and 27 in reference to the use of the term contiguous in the Amendments filed on July 1, 2004 but were not deleted or cancelled from the claims. The omissions occurred without deceptive intent, and should have appeared as originally filed.

Applicants provide a definition of the term "substantially contiguous" on page 4, line 17 *et seq.* that includes reticles and/or reticle areas that may abut each other or include a boundary area between the reticles and/or reticle areas. Thus Applicants respectfully assert that the limitation of "substantially contiguous" provides for the spatial relationship and division of the reticles and reticle areas on the mask in the claims.

Applicants have also amended Claims 1, 9, and 27 to provide clarity with respect to the alignment of reticles of each of the plurality of reticle areas with the associated synthesis area. Further, Applicants have added the terms a plurality of with respect to the

Application No.: 09/824,931

locations specified by each reticle for the purposes of clarity that each reticle specifies multiple locations for the coupling of a monomer. Applicants assert that no new matter is presented by these amendments and respectfully request entry of the same.

Also in the interview, the Examiner called Applicants attention to the Pierrat (U.S. Patent Serial No. 6,040,892) reference submitted in an Information Disclosure Statement filed January 8, 2004. Applicants submitted the information disclosure statement in a timely fashion after it was received in a European search report, but was received by the Examiner after the first Office Action was mailed on January 5, 2004.

Pierrat generally teaches a mask that includes a single reticle with a two dimensional array of spaced images used in the manufacture of integrated circuits on semiconductor wafers.

Applicants respectfully assert that Pierrat does not anticipate the claimed invention. Firstly, the claims of the present application and the description of Pierrat are directed to different arts. For instance the claims of the present application are directed to synthesizing polymers on a substrate. The description of Pierrat is directed to the manufacture of integrated circuits on a semiconductor wafer. There is no description, motivation, or suggestion in Pierrat to apply the described elements to the synthesis of polymers on a substrate. Therefore, Pierrat does not describe and does not make obvious the claimed limitations of coupling monomers at each alignment of a reticle to enable formation of polymers.

Applicants assert that Pierrat does not described each and every limitation contained in the claims and further that it would not be obvious to extend the similar elements described in Pierrat to cover each of the claimed limitations. For example,

Application No.: 09/824,931

Applicants respectfully assert that Pierrat does not describe the plurality of reticle areas disposed upon the same mask, where each reticle area is associated with a synthesis area on a substrate as claimed. Therefore, Pierrat also cannot describe the substantially contiguous arrangement of the reticle areas on the mask.

Further, Pierrat describes circuits formed at multiple levels where each level is associated with an image of the reticle (Col. 5, lines 41-48 of Pierrat). Applicants assert that the levels described in Pierrat are not the same as the claimed synthesis areas. Pierrat does not describe forming circuits in multiple levels in parallel, i.e. forming multiple levels at the same time, where the claimed invention includes coupling monomers to a plurality of synthesis areas based upon the alignment of the plurality of associated reticle areas.

Also, upon entry of this amendment each of independent claims 1, 9, and 27 include the limitations of each synthesis area on the substrate associated with a reticle area being separated by a discard area. Since Pierrat does not describe an analogous element to the synthesis areas, as described above, Pierrat cannot, and does not have description of a discard area that separates each synthesis area.

Applicants also respectfully assert that it would not be obvious to combine the disclosures of Hess et al. and Pierrat as there is no suggestion or motivation to combine, and further that such a combination still falls short of describing each and every claimed limitation.

Application No.: 09/824,931

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, Applicants believe all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions pertaining to this application or feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (781) 280-1522.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 01-0431.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

William R. McCarthy III Reg. No.: 55,788

Customer No.: 22886
Legal Department
Affymetrix, Inc.
3380 Central Expressway
Santa Clara, CA 95051
Tel: 781/280-1522
Fax: 781/687-9090